



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK  
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|

09/842,466      04/26/2001      HIROYASU KOKUBO      35576/233803

| EXAMINER |
|----------|
|----------|

HUMERA N. SHEIKH

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1615      10

DATE MAILED:

### INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) HUMERA N. SHEIKH      (3) MELISSA PENDLETON  
(2) KISHORE GOLAMUDI      (4)

Date of Interview: 01 MAY 2003

Type: ☒ Telephonic    ☐ Televideo Conference    ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: claims on record 1 & 6-20

Identification of prior art discussed: on record

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The differences between the instant invention + prior art (Berta US 4,820,524) were discussed. Applicant specifically discussed the term "continuous" coating layer. As it appears, Berta is still applicable as a 102 reference. However, Examiner Kishore suggested to Applicant to <sup>significantly</sup> amend the claims by the following: ① Amend claims to be "Product by Process" claims. ② incorporate the subject matter of Claim 10 into generic Claim 1, since Applicant

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

① notified Examiner that their invention results in a single continuous layered coating, wherein the preparation is exposed to UV radiation, which is also not taught by Berta. Examiner may conduct a further updated search and/or consideration to determine the allowability of the claims.